

MINUTES OF THE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
June 27, 1979  
7:30 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Board of Architectural Review was held this date with the following Members Present:

Mrs. Smith  
Mrs. Ramsey  
Mr. Farmer  
Mr. Lay

Members Absent:

Mrs. Wadlington  
Mr. Martin  
Mr. VanGroll

City Officials Present:

~~Mr. James H. Davis~~

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Smith. The minutes for the May 16, 1979 meeting were approved as recorded. The minutes for the May 21, 1979 meeting were approved as corrected.

Case No. 79-85: Sign for Lionbridge Antiques. The application was not available. Neither the applicant nor a representative was present to explain the case to the Board. No decisions were made in this case. Mrs. Smith was directed to talk with Mr. Muse and ask him to notify the applicant of the Board's inability to act because of lack of information. (There was more than one free-standing sign on the property before Lionbridge submitted its application. After applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Lionbridge hung its sign in the place of the Caperton Antiques sign. The Caperton sign was subsequently mounted on the building, above the basement door.)

A general discussion about the new Lionbridge sign followed. It is the Board's understanding that when a free-standing, non-conforming sign is removed, a new free-standing sign may not be hung in its place. It appears to the Board that, in fact, this is exactly what has happened in this case.

Case No. 79-86: The Michie Company, 213 Seventh Street. (Note: Refer to previous application dated November, 1976)

The earlier application was never acted on by the Michie Company. The new application suggests green textured asphalt shingles for the roof covering over most of the building. The Board approved the use of textured asphalt shingles, subject to the submission of samples, but expressed a preference for standing seam, metal roof covering. Mr. Lay said that tin was an appropriate roofing material for a house of this period. Samples to be submitted shall be viewed by the B.A.R. members individually. Votes for or against the samples are to be recorded and left with the samples in City Hall.

Page 2  
B.A.R. Minutes  
June 27, 1979

Case No. 79-87: Blue Ridge Mental Health, 409 3rd St., N.E. (Case withdrawn by the applicant)

Other Business:

Mr. Lay discussed the possibility of a statute of limitations for Certificates of Appropriateness. It seems that a defined, reasonable time could be established within which a proposed change should be implemented.

Mr. Farmer announced the Board's transfer from the Zoning Administrator's Office to the Office of Community Development.

Mrs. Smith announced that an alternate member of the B.A.R. will not be appointed. Stating that no other Board or Commission has an alternate member, City Council has informed the B.A.R. of its decision to eliminate this position.

Mrs. Smith reminded the Board of the upcoming election of officers at the July meeting. She then made a motion to appoint a nominating committee composed of Mrs. Ramsey and Mr. Lay. The motion was later amended to add Mr. Martin, and included a proviso that membership on the committee would not preclude a committee member from being nominated for office. Mr. Farmer seconded the amended motion. The motion passed on a 4-0 vote of the Board.

Mrs. Smith reported on her assigned task to prepare a concise explanation of the sign ordinance as it pertains to the A.D.C. District. She read the rough draft of the document to the Board. There was some general discussion on the subject of signs. Mrs. Smith was asked to consult with the City Attorney and report again to the Board in July with a final draft.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

---

John B. Farmer, Jr.  
Secretary

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Cole Hendrix, City Manager  
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S.S.H.  
DATE: July 5, 1979  
RE: BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

---

As per your instructions, we are proceeding to set up procedures to work with the Board of Architectural Review. I would like to take this opportunity to bring your attention steps we anticipate taking in the near future.

1. Discussion with Mr. Muse concerning the background of the Board of Architectural Review.
2. Set up a filing and data retrieval system.
3. Flow chart outlining steps to be followed by the public.
4. Meeting with the Chairman of the Board to discuss general directions.
5. Setting up staff reporting procedures. To date, the Board of Architectural Review has not gotten any background data on items on the agenda. We feel it may be appropriate to provide a brief staff report.
6. We are setting procedures for the preliminary conference with the staff to explain the relevant procedures and laws, and to provide guidance in content and nature of the application.
7. Meeting schedule and times.
8. Map showing all structures before 1870 and the historic district will be prepared as a reference.
9. Redesign application.
10. Review of historic district and sign ordinance, as they relate to the Board's procedures and criteria, and suggest any changes.
11. Review of the historic district's boundaries.

We hope to proceed with the above steps at the earliest possible date. Thank you.

cc. Ruth Wadlington  
Bob Stripling  
Ron Higgins

# BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW \*1

This procedure is applicable to the exterior architectural character of the structures and the environment visible from any public street in cases of demolition, construction or alterations to the following: a) Structures and areas within the ADC, b) Historic Landmarks, c) Other structures or sites designated by City Council, d) Structures in existence prior to 1870.

\*2 Height Limits

Applicant holds preapplication conference with the B.A.R. Chairman or Dept. of Community Development staff members to discuss the proposal and process.

2 Applicant should bring preliminary studies of concept and proposal to this meeting.

Section 31-142

Applicant picks up application for Certificate of Appropriateness from the Department of Community Development, Room 202, City Hall (295-4177).

3 Section 31-143

Application should be accompanied by the following data: 1) Detailed plan(s) of the project, 2) Photographs as required, 3) Samples of materials, 4) History of building and site if requested.

\*3 signs

Section 31-144

The Board of Architectural Review shall utilize the following criteria in their consideration: 1) Harmony of scale, 2) Harmony of materials, texture, colors and motifs, 3) Impact on the surrounding environment, 4) Historic or architectural significance of the proposed action, 5) Other criteria deemed necessary.

5 Section 31-145(b)

Applicant files application and appropriate data with the Director of Planning and Community Development 10 days prior to the next B.A.R. meeting date.

6 Section 31-143

Department of Community Development staff prepares background information as needed and sends information to the B.A.R. one week prior to their meeting date.

Board of Architectural Review members visit the site(s) in question during the week before the meeting date.

8

B.A.R. usually holds monthly meeting to review application. The B.A.R. takes action within 60 days of the submittal date or application is approved. The applicant is encouraged to attend the meeting.

9 Section 31-145(a)

If approved, the Director of Planning issues the Certificate of Appropriateness. Applicant then applies for building permit in the inspections division subject to: Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code (BOCA), the zoning ordinance and other conditions imposed by the B.A.R.

Section 31-145(a)

If denied, no certificate of appropriateness is issued.

11 Appeals can be made to City Council and then to the Circuit Court as specified in the City Code Section 31-147.1

Zoning inspector makes final site inspection after construction is completed to insure compliance with approved plans and specifications. Zoning inspector also conducts inspection for maintenance and repair required of the owner under Section 31-141.

12

\*1. For specific procedures and guidelines, see Article XVI of the City Code.

\*2. The maximum height in the ADC district shall not exceed 40' unless a special permit is granted by City Council; in such case, the Board of Architectural Review will have an additional opportunity to comment.

\*3. In the case of a sign request the following information will be needed: 1) Dimensions, 2) Subject Matter, 3) Color of letters, field, borders with samples, 4) Materials including post or support, 5) Letter styles and sizes, 6) Location on building or site with its context (i.e. window, door, etc.)

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Board of Architectural Review  
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S.S.H.  
DATE: July 16, 1979  
RE: Monthly Meeting

---

The purpose of this memorandum is to convey to you relevant information concerning the next meeting and take this opportunity to convey to you things that we think you may wish to consider as part of your organization and streamlining of the processes:

1. Proposed staff activities. Please find the attached memorandum dated July 5, which outlines the staff activities, which we hope to proceed with as support to you as a group.
2. Schedule of Meetings. We have re-done the schedule so that you, as well as the applicants, would know the filing deadlines. I would like to discuss with you the possibility of changing the meetings to the daytime. As I understand, two people, Mr. Lay and Mr. Van Groll, have some conflicts with the daytime during the school year. I have discussed this matter with Mr. Lay and he is receptive to the change of meeting as long as adjustments can be made later on. I have not been able to get hold of Mr. Van Groll as he is out of the country.
3. Procedure Chart. Please find attached a draft of the Procedure Chart which we think will assist the applicants as well as you. Feel free to make any comments.
4. Sign Ordinance. We would like to discuss with you your concerns and ways to deal with those concerns through possible interpretation as well as possible amendments to ordinance if necessary.
5. Staffing. Ron Higgins and I will be primarily working with you, and at least one of us will be at the meeting. In initial phases, I would play an active roll, but later on most likely Ron Higgins will be working with you more often than me.

We think, after a discussion of the above items, we could arrive at some sense of direction and we look forward to working with you. Thank you.

CITY OF  
CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VIRGINIA  
MEMO

---

TO: Board of Architectural Review  
FROM: Satyendra Singh Huja, Director of Planning and Community Development S.S.H  
DATE: July 16, 1979  
RE: Downtown Post Office - Alteration for Library

---

Attached is the final information which you requested on April 18, 1979 when granting conditional approval of the above. The drawings include the following:

1. Landscape Design - See site plan (first sheet)
2. Book-drop Design - See fourth sheet
3. Sign - See attached detail (8 1/2 x 11 sheet)  
- It should be noted here that the sign is permitted up to 25 square feet under Section 31-183(c) allowing government building identification.
4. Guardrail on ramp - See attached detail (8 1/2 x 11 sheet)  
. Entrance to Stair #1 - See third sheet - West elevation
6. Facia of loading dock - See third and fourth sheets
7. Exterior lighting - See site plan (first sheet)

The architect will be present to explain all details and to present material samples. At the meeting there will also be color elevations for your review.

This project is currently being reviewed by us for site plan approval. If you need any further information, please contact Ron Higgins at 295-4177. Thank you.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA.

Date July 12, 1979

Application is hereby made by:

M. Jack Rinehart, Jr. Architect A.I.A.  
(owner or Agent)

for the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project  
located at Second and Market Streets

under Chapter 31, Article 16, Section 140 of the Charlottesville City  
Code.

Description of the proposed work is as follows:

Alterations and Additions to the U.S. Federal Court and Post Office building  
for the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library. New Exterior work includes:

- New Entry Ramp
- New Stair/Elevator Towers
- New Loading Area
- New Building Sign
- New Landscaping

List of Enclosures: Sheet A1 Site Plan, Sheet A3 Level Two Floor Plan (Main  
Level showing plan of new construction seen from exterior), Sheet A6 Exterior  
Elevations, Sheet A8 Showing Elevation of Bookdrop, Revised Detail of Entry  
Ramp construction (8 1/2 x 11), Detail of Building Sign (8 1/2 x 11).

Received by:

Donald L. Ferguson  
Date July 12, 1979

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Samuel R. Paul  
Signature of Owner or Agent

407 Water Street

Address

295-7128

Telephone

City of Charlottesville  
Board of Architectural Review  
Docket.

July 25, 1979  
7:45 p.m.

Chairman: John Farmer  
Vice-Chair: Warren Martin  
Secretary: Ashlin Smith

✓ 1. Election of Officers

✓ 2. Minutes

✓ 1. June 27, 1979 Regular Meeting

✓ 3. Deferred Items

✓ 1. Case No. 79-79 New Sign for F. L. Buck  
Repeated Condition 400 East Jefferson Street

✓ 2. Case No. 79-85 New Sign for Lionbridge Antiques  
moved \$12.00 1113 West Main Street  
12 6-0 Bus Shelter? & Cans?

✓ 4. New Applications

✓ 1. Case No. 79-83 Charlottesville Regional Library  
Ramp - 60 but try to relocate Post Office Renovations-East Market Street  
CofA - 4/7 6-0

✓ 5. Other Matters

1. Sign Ordinance - Discussion

6. Department of Community Development Report

1. Staff Assistance and Procedures

Buck:

**No application file** but received  
cert. - wait until ord worked out.  
regard to post office  
MR. Caperton will be here  
Keith & Joan Goodenough 917-2786

✓ - called Sam to attend:  
- Jack Rinehart

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
JULY 25, 1979  
7:45 p.m.

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Architectural Review was held this date in the conference room of the Department of Community Development with the following members present:

Ruth Wadlington  
Ashlin Smith ✓  
John Farmer ✓  
Edward Lay ✓  
Warren Martin ✓  
Charlotte Ramsey

Approved  
4-0  
w 2 corrections

Members Absent

Theo Van Groll

City Officials Present

Satyendra Singh Huja  
Ronald Higgins

The meeting was called to order by Ruth Wadlington.

The report of the Nominating Committee was made by Charlotte Ramsey. Nominated as new officers of the Board of Architectural Review were:

John Farmer, Chairman  
Warren Martin, Vice-Chairman  
Ashlin Smith, Secretary

There were no nominations from the floor. The slate of the Nominating Committee was unanimously accepted, and the meeting was turned over to the new Chairman.

The minutes <sup>of June 1979</sup> were approved and seconded with the following correction: Delete "City Officials Present: James H. Davis".

Case No. 79-79: Sign for F.L. Buck. Deferred item. Since the new section of the sign ordinance dealing with the replacement or consolidation of existing signs is applicable to this case. The Board of Architectural Review unanimously repealed the conditions attached to the certificate of appropriateness requiring that the sign be attached to the building.

Case No. 79-83: Charlottesville Regional Library Post Office Renovations - East Market Street. New Application. Mr. Jack Rinehart, A.I.A., explained the final details of the project requested by the members of the Board of Architectural Review at their initial meeting with Mr. Rinehart on April 18, 1979. The details of the proposed changes in the post office building were presented in the following order.

1. Landscape design
2. Book-drop design
3. Sign
4. Guardrail on ramp
5. Entrance to Stair #1
6. Facia of loading dock
7. Exterior lighting

In his discussion of each of these changes, Mr. Rinehart, described any new materials to be used without the use of samples indicating that the selection of new materials will be based on the ability of the new materials to match the existing materials. With further questions the members of the Board of Architectural Review expressed their agreement with the architects desire to retain the original and monumental character of the post office. The only disagreement expressed was related to the concept of planning a ramp leading to the main entrance of the renovated building. The opinion was that although the Architect had designed the ramp to be as unobtrusive to the symmetry of the front facade as possible, a lack of symmetry was nevertheless noticeable and, therefore, detrimental to the original design of the building. Warren Martin suggested that if there were no legal restraints to the location of such a ramp, the Architect should study the possibility of placing a ramp at the side entrance on Second Street, NE. The Board then voted unanimously to grant a certificate of appropriateness on all points with the condition that the Architect explore the relocation of the ramp for the handicapped at the Second Street entrance.

Case No. 79-85: Sign for Lionbridge Antiques: Deferred Item. The owners of Lionbridge Antiques were present but no written data or drawings of their sign were presented. The size of the sign was in question. Mr. Huja and Mr. Higgins explained Section 31-171 of the City ordinance dealing with the replacement or consolidation of existing signs. The owners of the sign estimated the total sign surface to be no greater than 12 square feet. At the time that the dimensions of the sign can be certified and are in fact a total of 12 square feet, the Board of Architectural Review will grant a certificate of appropriateness.

Another matter discussed was the sign ordinance as it applies to the ADC District. After a meeting of Ashlin Smith and Ed Lay with the City Attorney and after a meeting of Ruth Wadlington and Ashlin Smith with the Department of Community Development earlier this month, there was sufficient interpretation of the sign ordinance by City officials for the members of the Board of Architectural Review to proceed with a study of ways in which the sign ordinance can further support the purpose of the District. Ashlin Smith and Ed Lay were appointed to initiate this study and present a list of questions and points to be discussed at the next regular meeting.

A report of the Department of Community Development reviewed the following matters:

1. Proposed staff activities.
2. Schedule of meetings, which after discussion will remain as already stated.
3. Procedure Chart, which was approved by the Board with the recommendation that footnote #1 be stated directly below the heading of the Chart.
4. Sign Ordinance which the department will further help to interpret and to which the department will assist the Board of Architectural Review members in making possible amendments.
5. Staffing.

Minutes of the  
Board of Architectural Review  
July 25, 1979  
7:45 p.m  
Page 3

6. Review of ADC boundaries and other types of sites with which the Board of Architectural Review is expected to deal, both now and in the future. On display was a map of the City delineating in different colors the ADC district and outside of it, structures built before 1870, significant structures built after 1870 and landmarks.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashlin Smith, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
June 27, 1979  
7:30 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Board of Architectural Review was held this date with the following Members Present:

Mrs. Smith  
Mrs. Ramsey  
Mr. Farmer  
Mr. Lay

Members Absent:

Mrs. Wadlington  
Mr. Martin  
Mr. VanGroll

City Officials Present:

Mr. James H. Davis

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Smith. The minutes for the May 16, 1979 meeting were approved as recorded. The minutes for the May 21, 1979 meeting were approved as corrected.

Case No. 79-85: Sign for Lionbridge Antiques. The application was not available. Neither the applicant nor a representative was present to explain the case to the Board. No decisions were made in this case. Mrs. Smith was directed to talk with Mr. Muse and ask him to notify the applicant of the Boards inability to act because of lack of information. (There was more than one free-standing sign on the property before Lionbridge submitted its application. After applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Lionbridge hung its sign in the place of the Caperton Antiques sign. The Caperton sign was subsequently mounted on the building, above the basement door.)

A general discussion about the new Lionbridge sign followed. It is the Board's understanding that when a free-standing, non-conforming sign is removed, a new free-standing sign may not be hung in its place. It appears to the Board that, in fact, this is exactly what has happened in this case.

Case No. 79-86: The Michie Company, 213 Seventh Street. (Note: Refer to previous application dated November, 1976)

The earlier application was never acted on by the Michie Company. The new application suggests green textured asphalt shingles for the roof covering over most of the building. The Board approved the use of textured asphalt shingles, subject to the submission of samples, but expressed a preference for standing seam, metal roof covering. Mr. Lay said that tin was an appropriate roofing material for a house of this period. Samples to be submitted shall be viewed by the B.A.R. members individually. Votes for or against the samples are to be recorded and left with the samples in City Hall.

Case No. 79-87: Blue Ridge Mental Health, 409 3rd St., N.E. (Case withdrawn by the applicant)

Other Business:

Mr. Lay discussed the possibility of a statute of limitations for Certificates of Appropriateness. It seems that a defined, reasonable time could be established within which a proposed change should be implemented.

Mr. Farmer announced the Board's transfer from the Zoning Administrator's Office to the Office of Community Development.

Mrs. Smith announced that an alternate member of the B.A.R. will not be appointed. Stating that no other Board or Commission has an alternate member, City Council has informed the B.A.R. of its decision to eliminate this position.

Mrs. Smith reminded the Board of the upcoming election of officers at the July meeting. She then made a motion to appoint a nominating committee composed of Mrs. Ramsey and Mr. Lay. The motion was later amended to add Mr. Martin, and included a proviso that membership on the committee would not preclude a committee member from being nominated for office. Mr. Farmer seconded the amended motion. The motion passed on a 4-0 vote of the Board.

Mrs. Smith reported on her assigned task to prepare a concise explanation of the sign ordinance as it pertains to the A.D.C. District. She read the rough draft of the document to the Board. There was some general discussion on the subject of signs. Mrs. Smith was asked to consult with the City Attorney and report again to the Board in July with a final draft.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

\_\_\_\_\_  
John B. Farmer, Jr.  
Secretary

Case No. 79-87: Blue Ridge Mental Health, 409 3rd St., N.E. (Case withdrawn by the applicant)

Other Business:

Mr. Lay discussed the possibility of a statute of limitations for Certificates of Appropriateness. It seems that a defined, reasonable time could be established within which a proposed change should be implemented.

Mr. Farmer announced the Board's transfer from the Zoning Administrator's Office to the Office of Community Development.

Mrs. Smith announced that an alternate member of the B.A.R. will not be appointed. Stating that no other Board or Commission has an alternate member, City Council has informed the B.A.R. of its decision to eliminate this position.

Mrs. Smith reminded the Board of the upcoming election of officers at the July meeting. She then made a motion to appoint a nominating committee composed of Mrs. Ramsey and Mr. Lay. The motion was later amended to add Mr. Martin, and included a proviso that membership on the committee would not preclude a committee member from being nominated for office. Mr. Farmer seconded the amended motion. The motion passed on a 4-0 vote of the Board.

Mrs. Smith reported on her assigned task to prepare a concise explanation of the sign ordinance as it pertains to the A.D.C. District. She read the rough draft of the document to the Board. There was some general discussion on the subject of signs. Mrs. Smith was asked to consult with the City Attorney and report again to the Board in July with a final draft.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

John B. Farmer, Jr.  
Secretary